

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 16, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. Claims 17, 18, 20, 25, 26, 28-30, 32-34, and 36 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration.

Claims 1-16, 19, 21-24, 27, 31, 35, and 37-41 have been canceled, claims 17, 25, 29, and 33 have been amended, and claims 42 and 43 have been added herein. The amended claims include limitations transferred from dependent claims (as also supported by at least page 16 of the Specification) and support for the added claims can be found in Figure 12 and paragraphs 0067 and 0068 of the Specification. The amendments and new claims are thus fully supported by the Specification and entry thereof is respectfully requested. A listing of claims can be found on pages 2-6 of this Response.

Favorable reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following comments.

I. Rejection of Claims 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, 32, 37, 38, 40, and 41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, 32, 37, 38, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0028748) (Sato). Claims 21, 22, 24, 37, 38, 40, and 41 have been canceled; their rejections are moot. It is respectfully requested that the rejections to claims 29, 30, and 32 be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Sato does not describe each and every element of the claims.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “*each and every element*” as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.”

In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (quoting *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added). In particular, amended independent claim 29 recites: “the components of the text region, the drawing region, the photograph region, and the background region encoded at *different quantization ratios*” (emphasis added). Sato does not describe this aspect.

The Examiner cites paragraph 0004 of Sato as corresponding to encoding (See Office Action mailed April 16, 2008, pg. 6). However, Sato does not disclose the claim as amended.

Paragraph 0004 of Sato does not disclose “the components of the text region, the drawing region, the photograph region, and the background region encoded at *different quantization ratios*” (emphasis added). Paragraph 0004 states the following.

In such a case, only part of the compression-coded data is transmitted to display the image at a resolution lower than the original resolution. For, e.g., JPEG that is a compression-coding scheme recommended by the ISO and ITU-T, a hierarchical encoding scheme is defined whereby an image can be decoded at a resolution lower than the original resolution by a factor of a power of 2.

In summary, paragraph 0004 of Sato explains that an image can be decoded at a lower resolution than the original resolution, which Sato refers to as a “hierarchical encoding scheme.” The lower resolution may be preferred in cases where the network does not have enough bandwidth to accommodate the higher resolution level without

substantial delay. However, decoding an image at a lower resolution does not disclose the encoding scheme of amended independent claim 29. Specifically, the cited paragraph is silent with respect to encoding different regions at “different quantization ratios” (See independent claim 29). Sato does not describe if and how an image would be divided into regions for encoding. Although Sato mentions the phrase “hierarchical encoding scheme,” this phrase likely refers to the difference between the resolutions of the original image (of higher resolution) and the decoded image (of lower resolution). However, the “hierarchical encoding scheme” does not correspond to hierarchically encoding the different regions of the image, since Sato does not disclose that the image is split into regions, much less that different quantization ratios would apply to these regions. For at least these reasons, Sato does not describe each and every element of independent claim 29, namely “the components of the text region, the drawing region, the photograph region, and the background region encoded at *different quantization ratios*” (emphasis added).

Claims 30 and 32 depend from independent claim 29, thus incorporating the limitations thereof. For at least the aforementioned reasons regarding independent claim 29, Sato does not describe each and every element of dependent claims 30 and 32. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 17-20, 23, 25-28, 31, 33-36, and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 17-20, 23, 25-28, 31, 33-36, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sato, in view of Navon *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,085,422) (Navon). Claims 19, 23, 27, 31, 35, and 39 have been canceled; their rejections are moot. Amended independent claims 17, 25, and 33 contain an aspect identical to amended independent claim 29, *i.e.*, “the components of the text region, the drawing region, the photograph region, and the background region encoded at *different quantization ratios*” (emphasis

added). The remaining dependent claims each depend from one of the aforementioned independent claims, thus incorporating the respective limitations thereof. The Examiner does not indicate and the Applicants do not discern any part of Navon that cures the aforementioned deficiencies of Sato regarding the aspect of the independent claims. For at least the above reasons regarding the independent claims, Sato and Navon, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations of these claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 7/14th/08



Michael J. Mallie

Registration No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
Telephone (408) 720-8300
Facsimile (408) 720-8383

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.



Angela Quinn

7-14-08
Date